

REMARKS

I. Status of Application

By the present Amendment, Applicant hereby cancels claims 1-14 without prejudice or disclaimer and adds new claims 15-21. Claims 15-21 are all the claims pending in the Application. Claims 1-14 have been rejected.

The present Amendment addresses each point of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Formalities

The Examiner has acknowledged Applicant's claim to foreign priority and has indicated receipt of the certified copy of the Priority Document.

The Examiner has returned the initialed Form PTO/SB/08 filed with the Information Disclosure Statement on June 21, 2005, indicating that all the references therein have been considered.

However, the Examiner has not yet indicated whether the drawing figures filed on June 21, 2005 have been accepted. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner approve the aforementioned drawings.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Goto et al. (JP 2003-025563) (hereinafter "Goto"). Applicant notes that claims 1-14 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and, therefore, the Examiner's rejections with respect to claims 1-14 are now moot.

IV. New Claims

By the present Amendment, Applicant hereby adds claim 15-21, which are fully supported by the original specification. No new matter has been added.

Applicant submits that new claims 15-21 are not anticipated by Goto because Goto fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in claims 15-21.

A. Independent Claim 15

For example, independent claim 15 recites (among other things):

A liquid ejecting apparatus comprising:
a first liquid ejecting section that ejects
a first liquid toward a medium;
a second liquid ejecting section that ejects
a second liquid toward the medium..
wherein an ejection amount of the first
liquid that reaches a region that is outside the
medium is not reduced,
wherein an ejection amount of the second
liquid that reaches the region that is outside
the medium is reduced.

As set forth above, claim 15 clearly requires that an ejection amount of the first liquid that reaches a region that is outside the medium is not reduced whereas, in contrast, an ejection amount of the second liquid that reaches the region that is outside the medium is reduced.

Independent claim 15 further requires the feature:

...wherein an amount of the second liquid that remains in the liquid recovery section when a predetermined amount of the second liquid has been ejected is larger than an amount of the first liquid that remains in the liquid recovery section when the predetermined amount of the first liquid has been ejected..

However, none of the above features are disclosed, or even remotely suggested, by Goto. Indeed, Goto provides no disclosure whatsoever regarding the feature of not reducing an ejection amount of a first liquid, while reducing an ejection amount of a second liquid, as recited in claim 15. Further, Goto fails to disclose or suggest that different amounts of the first liquid and the second liquid, respectively, remain in the liquid recovery section, as claimed.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 15 is not anticipated by Goto for *at least* these reasons. Moreover, Applicant submits that the dependent claims 16-18 are allowable *at least* by virtue of their dependency. As such, the allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

B. Independent Claim 19

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 19 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 15, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 15 demonstrate the patentability of claim 19. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

C. Independent Claim 20

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 20 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 15, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 15 demonstrate the patentability of claim 20. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

D. Independent Claim 21

In view of the similarity between the requirements of claim 21 and the requirements discussed above with respect to independent claim 15, Applicant respectfully submits that arguments analogous to the foregoing arguments as to the patentability of independent claim 15 demonstrate the patentability of claim 21. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 21 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references *at least* for reasons analogous to those presented above. Thus, the allowance of this claim is respectfully solicited of the Examiner.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 30, 2007